

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed February 28, 2006. Claims 1, 11, 21, 22, and 27 have been amended, and claim 7 has been cancelled. No new matter has been added. Therefore, claims 1-6, and 8-27 remain pending in this case. Reconsideration of the present case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-5, 8, 10-19, 21-24, and 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toh et al. (US 2003/0058284, "Toh") in view of Horky et al. (US 4,390,964, "Horky").

Claims 9 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toh in view of Horky and Verissimo et al. (US 5,841,654, "Verissimo").

Applicant respectfully submits that the U.S.C. § 103 rejections are rendered moot in light of the acceptance of allowed subject matter.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 6, 7, and 25 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner also stated:

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The best prior art of record fails to specifically teach or fairly suggest the card reader is operable to report at least two different device identifications specific to at least two different interfaces of memory cards.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 22 based on the Examiner's reasons for allowance of claims 6, 7, and 25, and respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance over the cited art. No new matter has been added.

For example, regarding claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Toh in view of Horky fails to teach or suggest **wherein the card reader is operable to report an interface of a memory card inserted into the card reader; and wherein the display is operable to display an icon specific to the interface of the memory card inserted into the card reader, wherein the icon is selected from a plurality of possible icons, and wherein each of the plurality of possible icons is specific to a respective one of a plurality of different memory card interfaces.** Instead, Toh teaches that an icon may be displayed in gray (or otherwise displayed in non-selectable mode) when a memory card is not connected, and be selectable when a memory card is connected. Neither Toh nor Horky, singly or in combination, teaches displaying an icon from a plurality of possible icons as recited in the claim. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Toh and Horky, taken singly, or in combination, fails to teach or suggest this feature of claim 1. Additionally, Applicant submits that claim 1 and those dependents dependent therefrom are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons provided above and the reasons for allowance provided by the Examiner.

Similarly, Applicant submits that Toh in view of Horky fails to teach or suggest **reporting a device identification, to the host controller, specific to an interface of the memory card inserted into the card reader, wherein the device identification is selected from a plurality of device identifications, and wherein each of the plurality of device identifications is specific to a respective one of a plurality of different memory card interfaces** as recited in claim 11. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 and those dependents therefrom are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons provided above and in light of the allowance of claim 6.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that Toh in view of Horky fails to teach or suggest **receiving a device identification of a plurality of device identifications, from the host controller, specific to the format of the memory card inserted into the card reader, wherein each of the plurality of device identifications is specific to a respective one of a plurality of different memory card formats** as recited in claim 22. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 and those dependents therefrom are in

condition for allowance for at least the reasons provided above and in light of the allowance of claim 6.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-5, and 8-27 are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited art, and are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5707-06300/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey C. Hood
Reg. No. 35,198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 4/26/2006 JCH/MSW/JLS